

25878

October 13, 1965

must not be precluded. Before shackling direct investment with mandatory controls the administration must ask where it wants to go and whether it is traveling in the right direction.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, when Senator RUSSELL addressed the State Kiwanis convention at Jekyll Island in Georgia recently, he was introduced by Maj. Gen. Carl T. Sutherland, one of the Nation's outstanding Reserve officers and the former president of the Reserve Officers Association.

I ask unanimous consent that General Sutherland's remarks introductory of the senior Senator from Georgia, who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, which pay eloquent tribute to one who has done so much for his State and Nation, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RICHARD B. RUSSELL.

(Address by General Sutherland)

If the late Sir Winston Churchill were here to introduce our speaker, he probably would begin, "Seldom have so many owed so much to one man."

The contributions of this man to our country and especially to Georgia, are so many and so varied that they cannot be recited in a brief introduction. He has labored so long and so effectively for our State and Nation that we are prone to take him and his accomplishments for granted. For that reason a brief résumé of his career and accomplishments is in order.

His public service began when he left the University of Georgia to enlist in the Navy in World War I. After the war he returned to Winder where he practiced law for 12 years. At 22 he was elected to the Georgia House of Representatives where he served 10 years, the last 4 as speaker, before becoming the youngest Governor in Georgia history in 1930 at age 33. During the next 2 years of the great depression he directed the State government in an austerity program that kept the State's finances sound, and spearheaded a sweeping reorganization of the State government resulting in the reduction of 102 departments, bureaus, and commissions to 17 and a considerable reduction in the cost of operation. By consolidating the independently administered State supported colleges into a unified system, RUSSELL's reorganization laid the foundation for the present model university system.

At 35 he became the then youngest Member of the U.S. Senate. In this August body where seniority counts so heavily, he now is the second most senior Member, though many Members are older than he; and without doubt he is the most influential and highly respected of the 100 Members. Former President Truman has said many times, "If Dick RUSSELL had been from Indiana, or Missouri, or Kentucky, he may very well have been President of the United States."

The Senator's contributions to Georgia and the Nation have been many and great. He successfully sponsored the basic agriculture conservation programs now in effect, the rural electrification program, and the Farmers Home Administration. He is the father of the school lunch program, which provides 17 million underprivileged children, 620,000 of them Georgians, with a balanced and nutritious daily meal, probably the only decent one they receive during the day.

A strong advocate of river and water resources development, he has obtained funds to finance giant multipurpose dams and navigation projects on the Flint, Chattahoochee, Savannah, and other major rivers.

Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he is the Senate's foremost authority on military matters and is a forceful and effective champion of a strong national defense, including a sound Reserve program. A significant consequence of his responsibilities over military matters has been to place Georgia in a strong position to participate in vital defense activities. The 15 major military posts in the State, plus the huge Lockheed aircraft plant at Marietta, provide civilian employment for 55,000 Georgians. One billion three hundred million dollars a year pour into Georgia's economy from payrolls, purchases, and contracts by military installations located throughout our State.

Because of his long service he is the ranking Democrat member of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee, which provides money for all of the Nation's military activities. Federal agriculture programs, river development, education and health activities, highway construction, housing and community facilities projects, airports, space programs, atomic energy projects, and many other activities of the Federal Government.

Though known throughout the Nation for his many and varied interests and accomplishments, he probably is best known outside Georgia for his outspoken advocacy of States rights and his staunch defense of constitutional government.

We are grateful to Senator RUSSELL for his many contributions to Georgia, and we particularly appreciate his making special arrangements to speak to us today. I have the honor, Governor Ed, ladies, and gentlemen, to present a great Georgian, a longtime member of the Kiwanis Club of Winder, the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, senior U.S. Senator from Georgia.

OVERSEAS CARGOES FROM PORTS ON THE GREAT LAKES

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on September 10, I made a speech in the Senate deplored the unwillingness of American-flag ships to carry cargoes overseas from U.S. ports on the Great Lakes.

I urged that steps be taken to enable shippers—both the Federal Government and private concerns—to reduce costs by shipping directly from lake ports instead of having to use expensive overland transportation to east coast ports.

The lack of American bottoms to carry this traffic hurts Midwest producers—by denying them the benefits of lower shipping costs and hurts the balance-of-payments situation of the United States by too great use of foreign-flag ships.

The Maritime Administration has now issued findings and recommendations on Great Lakes foreign trade routes—which more than confirm the points I made then.

These findings include the shocking fact that only about 4 percent of overseas shipping originating in U.S. ports on the Great Lakes is being carried in American-flag vessels.

I had understood that the American flag situation was pretty bad on the lakes—but I had never imagined it was as bad as this. Only 43 out of approximately 1,000 overseas sailings in 1964 were American flag vessels. Of the 6,160,000 commercial tons, Public Law

480 and AID cargoes, and 84,811 measurement tons of defense cargoes—only about 4 percent was carried in American bottoms.

On behalf of the Conference of Great Lake Senators of which I am chairman, I endorse the recommendations of the Maritime Administration—and urge that they be implemented at the earliest possible moment.

They should not be allowed to lie dormant as was the case with the 1961 Department of Defense study of the Great Lakes—which proved that great savings were available through the use of Great Lakes ports.

The three major recommendations of the report are:

First. Consolidation and delineation of separate Great Lakes overseas trade routes: This means recognition of the Great Lakes as a separate seacoast, no longer to be treated as a stepchild by American flag lines concerned only with shipping from east coast ports.

Second. An incentive operating subsidy for the solicitation and carriage of non-Government impelled cargo from the area: This can provide the impetus needed to attract American flag shipping to the Great Lakes.

Third. Concentration of overseas cargoes at major ports through the development of land-sea container services and feeder-type operations by barge: New technology can make a major difference in the use of the Great Lakes. This proposal seems to forecast approval of the proposed Prudential Lines operation using container ships and barges, which I support strongly.

The Conference of Great Lakes Senators has often charged that the lack of American-flag ships on the Great Lakes has increased costs to overseas shippers, especially the Federal Government.

This charge has been substantiated by the Maritime Administration in this report, which emphasizes that the Departments of Defense and Agriculture are required to tranship a considerable proportion of Government cargo to east coast ports at extra expense in order to obtain the U.S.-flag overseas transportation required by law.

While the Great Lakes area has made tremendous investments to improve its facilities and deepen its harbors, the area is still being boycotted by American-flag ships. The Great Lakes area contributes in excess of 40 percent of Federal income taxes, but is not receiving a fair share of subsidized U.S. shipping.

The Great Lakes Conference of Senators intends to keep a close watch on the execution of the recommendations of this report, and will do all it can to assure that the proposed steps are taken.

A NEW CONFIDENCE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, things are looking up in South Vietnam. We have evidence increasing daily that the Vietcong are becoming more dispirited under the pressures of American commitment to the fight there. And we have strong evidence that our very commitment has also given the South Vietnamese people, and particularly that na-

October 13, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

25877

Day, I could not help speculating as to whether Christopher Columbus, prior to each of his voyages, secured all of the necessary funds to set sail on each voyage, all in one sum, in the form of a single allocation from the Spanish monarchy. I suspect that deficiency requests were well known in those days, too, and that supplemental allocations were often necessary to meet unexpected costs of approved projects.

Today, the financing methods used by European royalty during the century when Columbus explored the New World—pawning of royal jewels or taxation of subjects—are only incidental to the historical value of Columbus' feats. We, in America, do well to pay homage to his courage and perseverance. In this spirit, I have again this year served as cosponsor of a Senate bill, S. 108, to recognize Columbus Day, October 12, as a national holiday. During the 88th session of Congress, I cosponsored a similar bill which was passed by the Senate but failed of House action. The Senate Judiciary Committee has not yet reported out S. 108, but it is my hope that both Houses of Congress will see fit to act favorably on this measure in time for the commemoration of Columbus Day as a U.S. national holiday in 1966.

WATER RESOURCES OF THE DELAWARE PENINSULA

MR. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in conjunction with my distinguished colleague from Maryland, and both of the distinguished Senators from Delaware, I recently introduced S. 2287, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a 5-year study of the water resources of the Delaware Peninsula for the purpose of determining whether fresh water supplies could meet anticipated future requirements. I have recently received a letter from Mr. Brinton Whitall, Secretary of the Delaware River Basin Commission, advising me that the commission has adopted a resolution which unanimously endorses this legislation. The resolution stresses the importance of this study to the commercial and industrial well-being of the entire Middle Atlantic region.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Whitall's letter and the text of the resolution be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION,
Trenton, N.J., September 22, 1965.
Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
443D Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: The attached resolution conveys the endorsement and support of the Delaware River Basin Commission of legislation now before the Congress (S. 2287) authorizing a 5-year hydrologic study of the Delmarva Peninsula. This resolution was passed by unanimous vote of the commission on September 13, 1965.

Sincerely yours,

W. BRINTON WHITALL,
Secretary.

No. 191—3

RESOLUTION OF THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION IN RELATION TO THE WATER RESOURCES OF THE DELMARVA PENINSULA

Whereas the Delaware River Basin Commission confers upon this commission broad Federal and interstate responsibilities for the development, management, and control of the water resources of the Delaware River Basin; and

Whereas the commission recognizes that the aquifers beneath the basin portion of Delaware extend beneath the surface boundary of the basin and many also underlie the Delmarva Peninsula; and

Whereas large numbers of people as well as commercial and industrial enterprises are entirely dependent upon these underground supplies of fresh water; and

Whereas the taking of water from aquifers beyond the boundaries of the basin may influence their behavior within the basin, or vice versa; and

Whereas available information indicates that portions of the aquifers are threatened by saline water from Delaware Bay, Chesapeake Bay, and the Atlantic Ocean; and

Whereas the interrelationships among the fresh and saline water supplies and many of these aquifers are imperfectly known at the present time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Delaware River Basin Commission:

1. The commission endorses and supports the enactment of S. 2287, a bill to authorize a 5-year hydrologic study of the Delmarva Peninsula, and urges the Congress of the United States to act favorably thereon at an early date.

2. The secretary of the commission is authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the congressional delegation of the basin, and to Members of the House and Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Adopted: September 13, 1965.

EFFECT OF FOREIGN INVESTMENT CONTROLS ON THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY AND WORLD LIQUIDITY

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion into the RECORD of an October 12 Washington Post editorial which reiterates Senator McCARTHY's and my position with regard to the effect on the domestic economy and world liquidity of tighter controls on foreign investment.

I am pleased that the Post editorial calls attention to the possible adverse effects of augmenting a policy which is so strict, not in its initial step, but in its multiplier effect. I call attention to the statement:

They (the banking establishment) concede that reducing the outflow of U.S. capital inhibits growth in recipient countries.

The editorial calls upon the administration "to ask where it wants to go and whether it is traveling in the right direction." The short run obvious solution may pinch our economy and move the international community toward crisis.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Oct. 12, 1965]

DIRECT FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Since there can be a perilously thin line between voluntarism and compulsion in Fed-

eral programs, one can only hope that Commerce Secretary Connor's distaste for controls over the direct foreign investments of American enterprises will not be weakened. Some rather powerful voices, notably that of the organized bankers, have been raised in support of the contention that such controls are essential in the effort to eliminate this country's balance-of-payments deficit. But before another barrier to the free flow of money and goods is erected, its consequence for the American economy—and indeed, the world economy—should be pondered.

Direct foreign investment, in contradistinction to indirect investment, occurs when an American company or its subsidiary builds or acquires productive facilities in another country. At the end of 1964 the direct foreign investments of the United States were valued at \$44.3 billion. Another \$21 billion was indirectly invested in marketable securities—stocks and bonds—and in bank loans and other credits to foreigners. Thus, the grand total of foreign investments at the end of last year was \$75.4 billion.

The sale of foreign securities in the money markets of this country is inhibited by a tariff known as the interest equalization tax. The extension of bank loans to foreign borrowers is limited by a quota which the Federal Reserve authorities impose. And now eyes are being turned toward direct foreign investment.

All impediments to the international migration of capital are objectionable, but a particularly strong case can be made against those affecting direct investment. Unlike many types of indirect investment—bank loans, for example—the income from direct investment tends to exceed the capital outflow. Last year the net inflow or surplus from direct foreign investment was nearly \$1.4 billion, a significant plus factor in the balance of payments.

Moreover, exports are likely to be tightly tied to direct investment. It is estimated that a dollar of direct foreign investment increases U.S. exports by between 20 and 25 cents. In the case of Australia, a country whose growth rate is now largely determined by the size of the capital inflow, a dollar of direct investment probably induces a demand for as much as 50 cents in U.S. exports.

Those who speak for the establishment concede that limiting the volume of direct foreign investment will eventually, if not immediately, weaken this country's balance-of-payments position. They concede that reducing the outflow of U.S. capital inhibits growth in the recipient countries. But they insist that the restrictions are necessary evils, measures that must be adopted in order to eliminate the U.S. payments deficit and convince the Europeans that they should join in the reform of the international monetary system.

But can it be assumed that this balance-of-payments strategy is valid? Will the Western Europeans whose dissatisfaction with a dollar-gold standard is essentially political really be impressed by an economic accomplishment? If the policymakers cannot answer this question with an affirmative certitude, then they must surely ask themselves some others. Is it really necessary to risk undermining this country's competitive position in world trade? Are the alternatives so unpalatable that this country is justified in abandoning its principles by erecting new and perhaps permanent barriers to trade? And is it necessary to risk the worldwide stagnation that will follow if the savings generated by the American economy are no longer permitted to flow into areas where they nourish economic growth?

The necessity for maintaining confidence in the dollar and the pound sterling has led to an obsession with balance-of-payments tactics. But introspection about strategy

tion's army, a needed boost of confidence and morale.

Richard Fryklund, writing in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, says that the new South Vietnamese self-confidence, engendered by the American ground engagements of the past summer, lifts the hopes for eventual victory in that brutal, dirty war. Psychology plays an important role in any contest, in any war, Mr. President, but in none is it more important than in pursuit of a guerrilla campaign. That is the point of Fryklund's column. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIFT FOR THE VIETNAMESE SPIRIT

(By Richard Fryklund)

Three historic battles this summer transformed a dwindling, dispirited South Vietnamese Army into a confident fighting force.

In the long run, American military leaders feel, these battles may have made it possible for South Vietnam really to win in the far future.

Interestingly, it was the American role in these battles that worked the change. By showing what they could and would do in battle, the Americans converted the image of our side from that of a loser to a winner.

The first battle, at Duc Co, August 10, saw the first ground combat by Americans on a large scale. To the South Vietnamese—and to many Asians outside the Communist world—Duc Co showed that the United States was in fact engaged in a land war on the mainland of Asia.

The second battle, at Chu Lai, August 19, showed that the Americans could beat the Vietcong when conditions were right. And the third battle, at An Khe, September 18, showed that the Americans could still win when almost everything went wrong.

Most Americans assume that the complexion of the war changed last February when the first U.S. marines were sent to Vietnam. This was viewed in Washington as a total commitment to fight indefinitely with whatever was needed to get a favorable outcome.

But the Asians saw it differently. To them, Uncle Sam was only dipping a toe into the water.

Air support, advice, and equipment were nice, but they did not commit the United States. And the ground force which the United States managed to get ashore by mid-summer looked like a token, not even large enough to defend the American bases.

But Duc Co was different. That was an outpost well inland, not far from the Cambodian border. Elements of the American 173d Airborne Brigade and 1st Infantry Division were there in a support role, but they were there, and they were fighting.

The United States was committed to a land war.

Americans who accompanied South Vietnamese units into that battle say the knowledge that they were side by side with American infantrymen turned them into chargers.

They were aggressive and confident. They remembered what their advisers had taught them. They did things right.

The Chu Lai battle was an American show. The marines had intelligence of a Vietcong concentration; they planned an attack; they surprised the Vietcong with a land, sea, and air operation, cornered them and chewed them up.

American casualties were light, the Vietcong's very heavy.

Some academic students of guerrilla wars say they can find only one common ingredient of past successes. Many techniques are useful under a great variety of circumstances, but history shows that in order to win, you have to look like a winner.

At Chu Lai, the American side looked like a winner for the first time in Vietnam. And they have been looking that way ever since.

In their own minds, so have the South Vietnamese soldiers. An accurate scorekeeper might have tallied a few defeats this summer, but you can't tell that to the friendlies.

So in August, the United States was committed, and our side was rolling.

There was no particular thought of setbacks until September 18, when reports reached Saigon that an American battalion had blundered into a Vietcong trap and had been defeated.

Almost immediately, however, the true story became clear. Part of the 101st Airborne Division had been dropped by helicopter in the middle of an enemy battalion, but the isolated and surrounded Americans had rallied and won with professional skill and, most important, quick bomber support.

Even better for morale, the South Vietnamese were convinced that it was a North Vietnamese unit (part of the 95th Regiment of the 325th North Vietnamese Division) that was upset by the Americans at An Khe.

It may not have been a North Vietnamese unit—the intelligence is not conclusive—but it is good for morale that people think so.

If the new Vietnamese self-confidence that was generated by the American ground engagements endures, then there is hope for eventual victory.

For it is the South Vietnamese forces, not the Americans, who will have to stick it out in the long run and win.

THOMAS H. WARD—BALTIMORE CITY COUNCILMAN

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, one of the most active and articulate city councilmen in Baltimore is a young attorney, Thomas Ward. Mr. Ward has been the only elected official in the city to recognize the desperate need for mass transit facilities in the Baltimore area.

The October issue of Baltimore magazine, published by the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, includes an excellent article by Sunpapers reporter John Goodspeed on this dynamic young man.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UP AND COMER

(By John Goodspeed)

(NOTE.—Tom Ward, city councilman and budding boss, could be described as a young curmudgeon; his stormy and uncertain political career started as a battle against brutes, ruffians and brahmins.)

One of the city councilmen from the Second district, Thomas Henry Ward, is occasionally called one of the up-and-coming young politicians of Baltimore. Yet his first run for public office may have been his last.

"I haven't made my mind up to run again," the 38-year-old Ward said recently. "In office you're a political football, and I don't get that much kick out of it."

For a man who doesn't enjoy kicking, Tom Ward has done quite a lot. During his 11 years in the public arena (2½ years in the council), he has:

Moved to nullify the entire East-West Expressway project, as proposed, by removing money for it from the city budget;

Denounced the overhead destination signs on the city approaches to the Jones Falls Expressway as "monstrous eyesores";

Described the pro-expressway Maryland State Roads Commission director, John B. Funk, as "an enemy of the people";

Opposed some aspects of urban renewal, principally the demolition of houses; Described the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency as "loaded with incompetents";

Tangled with the Health and Parks departments to save pigeons, trees and picturesque old concert band shells.

Ward isn't always kicking. He is positively in favor of a Baltimore subway; of increasing real estate values in Bolton Hill, the downtown residential area where he lives; of more police protection; of urban renewal for the inner harbor, and of redistricting the city so that his Second district, long controlled by white votes, would expand to include a 42-percent Negro population.

Ward is outspoken. "The disinterest of the average person in politics has resulted in brutes and ruffians having plenty of say in Government," he has written in the monthly newsletter of the Mount Royal Democratic Club (Tom Ward, president).

He founded the club in 1954 with 10 interested persons. (He prefers the old name, Mount Royal, to either of the newer names, Bolton Hill or Madison Park North/South.) His purpose was to combat the entrenched and haughty "brahmins" there. Young newcomers, many of them business and professional people, have increased the Mount Royal Democratic Club membership until its size is now "confidentially, in the high hundreds," according to its leader.

Ward is the first Bolton Hill councilman to be elected for the second district since Philander B. Briscoe, a Brahmin, served in the 1930's. Two other Mount Royal Democratic Club members hold elected office—Maryland General Assembly Delegates Julian L. Lepides and Frank J. McCourt. McCourt has parted company with Ward.

Before brutes, ruffians or even the east Baltimore political faction he opposes rejoice that Tom Ward may never run for office again, they should hear what else he said in his Linden Avenue law office:

"But I will always be active in politics. I will always stand on the corner on election day."

Ward has laid the foundation to become a political boss—one of those non-office-holding civic leaders who in Baltimore stand on the corner on election day to win votes, influence patronage, and keep an eye on their club members.

Ward is a native Baltimorean, as is his wife, the former Joyce McCartney, and their two children (soon three). He is a medium-short man with a "black Irish" look that is slightly less fierce since he shaved a remarkable mustache that stood out on television when he was sergeant at arms for the Maryland delegation at the 1960 Democratic National Convention.

He is the son of a railroad trackman who worked his way up to general supervisor of terminals for the B. & O. He was graduated from the Valley Forge Military Academy, the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and the University of Maryland Law School.

He has worked as a farmhand, a shipyard electrician, a meatcutter, a freight trucker, and a police reporter for the Baltimore Sun (his half brother is Paul W. Ward, the Sun's United Nations correspondent).

Tom Ward says he wants to devote more time to his real estate in Baltimore (five Bolton Hill houses) and West Virginia (a partnership in 2,600 acres of timberland,

25880

with mineral rights). He will still be a "take charge" guy, though. When he was 17, he rose in a short time to be chief yard clerk at the B. & O.'s Mount Clare shops in Baltimore.

He is a natural boss. Tom Ward may be one of the up-and-coming political bosses of Baltimore.

CRITICISM OF U.S. POLICY IN VIETNAM STILLED

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we have endured a lengthy period of criticism and protest against our Government's policies in South Vietnam. But in more recent days, as William S. White has written in today's Washington Post, the criticism, though not a thing entirely of the past, has been stilled and the isolationism of the sixties is dying out, both here and among our allies abroad.

Public realization that the course of America in holding firm in southeast Asia is both necessary and right has, in short, grown. White's column makes the point that, abroad, the British Government of Prime Minister Harold Wilson has become our chief associate in quieting the critics. White's praise for the Prime Minister's achievement is noteworthy and should be heeded. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that his column "Vietnam Support—Critics Finally Stilled" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1965]
VIETNAM SUPPORT—CRITICS FINALLY STILLED

(By William S. White)

For the first time, it can be said with confidence that the long attack upon the American policy of resisting Communist aggression in Vietnam by candid military force is clearly failing, both in this country and in Europe.

The new isolationism of the sixties—an isolationism expressed in recommendations that in one way or another we should abandon the South Vietnamese and cut and run from Asia under elegant rhetoric protesting that we were not running at all—is dying at last.

Its death at home—and a slow death it has been through 2 years of almost constant biting at American purposes—is manifest, both in what is now happening and in what is now not happening. The shrill outcries formerly heard so often from a Democratic fringe in the Senate are heard no longer, except here and there and in very minor key.

The hostile student teach-ins are not altogether a thing of the past. But apart from the fact that proresistance teach-ins are now also being organized—for example, one to be held in Washington on October 16—these academic fevers were never more than a nuisance. And they never reflected in the least way any substantial opinion in this country, any more than the little band of complaining Democratic Senators ever represented anything more than a fragment of Congress.

The mischief of the teach-ins and of the clamors of the Senate splinter was that they warmed our critic abroad, particularly in Britain, with a suggestion of togetherness—the wonderful notion that the true intellectuals in the United States at all events were not standing with a line of resistance to Communist imperialism to which three American Presidents had successively given their word.

This implication that the real brains here were against the war of resistance was, of course, always absurd. Far the greater proportion of the intellectual community was always in support of this Government. Still, it was never so strident, so skilled at self-publicity. So it was the opposition that was largely heard in Europe.

Yet, as the Johnson administration on this issue has steadily enlarged its backing at home—and spectacularly so in recent weeks, as the Harris poll has just confirmed—so has our position improved in that focal point of important foreign criticism which is England.

Indeed, the Labor Government of Harold Wilson has now become the most useful of all our associates in beating back the mixed international group—of mere beatniks, of honest semipacifists, of decent ultraliberals enchanted with the delusion that it is always possible to halt Communist incursions by mere negotiation—that had so long given the U.S. Government so much trouble.

The magnitude of Wilson's achievement at the recent Labor Party convention at Blackpool in England in destroying their case has not been appreciated here. This erstwhile ban the bomber, this man who was once the very secular Pope of the neutralist-minded men of the West, has done more than grow in stature as a Prime Minister when at last he had to confront head on the hard realities of this world. He has become a strong and courageous party leader as well.

For at Blackpool Wilson proved to even the most skeptical, point by point, historical fact by historical fact, that those who refuse an honorable peace in Vietnam are not bad old Yankees but rather Communists—and mainly Chinese Communists at that. When he had done, the howlers had no case left.

His Foreign Minister, Michael Stewart, in his current visit here has in a quieter way done much the same thing. Neither publicly nor privately has Stewart given the smallest comfort to those Americans who had hoped to elicit from him some kind of sniping at some point of the policy in Vietnam.

A Conservative government in London could not have been so helpful. For British Conservatives, like American conservatives, are suspect from the word go on any rationally hardline enterprise whatever. When authentic very-liberals like Wilson and Stewart stand with us nobody can possibly accuse them of professional Communista-baiting. Anglo-American politics works in illogical ways, sometimes, its wonders to perform.

WISCONSIN: NO. 1 IN DAIRY BY A MILE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, during the recent debate on the farm bill claims were made about the agricultural production of many States. The farm bill included some provisions which we hope will be helpful to America's dairy farmers. Certainly these dairy farmers deserve an opportunity to earn a better income.

Their efficiency has vastly increased as has their investment. Their hours of work probably exceed those in any other occupation. And yet their income continues at an insulting rate—in my State, for example, of less than 50 cents per hour.

Mr. President we will be watching the effect of the new farm bill on our farmers in Wisconsin closely; and we will be prepared to urge as hard as we know how for whatever changes may be necessary to enable these farmers to earn a fair return.

October 13, 1965

Wisconsin's stake in dairying is not just legendary. It is a big fact. Our State produces nearly half of all the cheese in America. We are way out in front in almost every dairy category.

Recently the Wisconsin Agriculturalist and Farmer printed statistics from the Wisconsin Statistical Reporting Service that document this. I ask unanimous consent that this brief explanation and table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the explanation and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM FACTS AND FIGURES—NO. 1 IN DAIRY

How Wisconsin continues to hold top place in the Nation's dairy industry is illustrated in the following table. Last year the State ranked first in milk production with nearly 19 billion pounds, first in 11 manufactured dairy products, second in 6 and third in 1 more.

During 1964, Wisconsin dairy plants produced more than a fifth of the Nation's butter and over two-fifths of the cheese. Included in cheese production were a third of the Swiss cheese made in the Nation, half the Italian and nearly half of the American cheese.

More than a third of the sweetened condensed whole milk and almost half of the sweetened condensed skim milk, bulk goods, produced in the Nation in 1964 came from Wisconsin plants. More than a fifth of the dry skim milk for human use and all of the malted milk powder was made in Wisconsin.

Wisconsin's rank in the Nation's dairy industry—1964

Product	Rank among States	Wisconsin production (pounds)	Percent of United States
Butter	2	317,307,000	22.0
Cheese:			
American	1	522,198,000	45.1
Swiss	2	38,646,000	31.6
Munster	1	21,534,000	74.7
Brick	1	15,935,000	67.6
Limbburger	1	1,609,000	55.9
Italian	1	110,609,000	50.2
Blue Mold	1	12,566,000	74.6
Total cheese (excluding cottage cheese)	1	761,968,000	44.1
Condensed milk, bulk:			
Sweetened, whole	1	22,112,000	37.1
Sweetened, skim	1	26,136,000	45.1
Unsweetened, whole	3	35,542,000	10.1
Unsweetened, skim	2	93,191,000	11.4
Evaporated whole milk, unsweetened, case	6	123,297,000	6.5
Dry products:			
Whole milk	5	10,462,000	11.9
Skin milk for human use	2	468,158,000	21.5
Skin milk for animal feed	2	3,589,000	16.3
Whey	1	138,433,000	37.7
Buttermilk	2	23,937,000	26.0
Malted milk powder	1	22,369,000	100.0
Ice cream (gallons)	9	25,050,000	3.4
Milk production	1	18,887,000,000	14.9

¹ Preliminary figure.

Source: Wisconsin Statistical Reporting Service.

TAX SAVING PASSED ON TO CONSUMERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the repeal of many excise taxes by the 89th Congress was based, in part, on the belief that manufacturers and retailers would pass the savings on to the consumer. I am proud to note that the

Columbus' famed voyage, from documents describing the journey of Leif Erikson, the Icelandic explorer, to a new land in the year 1000.

Assuming it to be as authentic as scholars believe after 8 years of tracing circumstances, wormholes and watermarks, the map is unlikely to disturb seriously Columbus' standing as the official discoverer of America. For this rating has stood for centuries in face of the well-known sagas of the 11th-century explorations.

The courage of these earlier voyagers does not detract from Columbus' persistence in the face of repeated rebuffs, the brave journey of the *Santa Maria*, the *Pinta*, and the *Nina* across uncharted seas, and the fact that their mission led to the permanent settlement of the New World. In brief, the New World was opened 473 years ago today on October 12, 1492.

[From the Star-Ledger, Oct. 12, 1965]

A NEW DISCOVERY

A lot of waves have rolled up America's eastern shoreline since Christopher Columbus set out in 1492 to sail the ocean blue in quest of new, uncharted lands.

Similarly, there has been a lot of scholarly controversy over whether the Genoa sailor was the first to touch American soil, an expedition that was underwritten by a Spanish queen seeking new lands to enrich her empire.

And today, as the Nation celebrates another Columbus Day with appropriate pomp, parades and pageantry, a discordant note has been sounded by Yale University scholars. They have come up with documentary proof that Chris did not get here first, that he did not, after all, discover America.

It is doubtful that this astonishing news will cause any bugler in the numerous bugle and drum corps that will participate in today's numerous parades to hit a clunker, a sour note.

But it must be noted, for historical archives a map has been found that was drawn in 1440, many years before Columbus had even the foggiest notion about a hemisphere beyond the horizon, showing that many Europeans knew America existed before the doughty navigator supplied physical proof.

While the scholarly discovery has documented credence, it is not expected to diminish the historical importance of Columbus' contribution, a feat of epoch proportions in the glowing era of discovery, as man sought to push back the horizons that concealed new lands, new people and new cultures.

Columbus made the America as we know it today possible, establishing the first substantial physical contact that opened up a new hemisphere for people across the ocean. This is the discoverer we have come to accept as a symbol of the early America, that strange, fertile and wonderful land that mixed intermittently hardship and hope.

Building Permits in Hawaii Rise by 42 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii continues to enjoy a healthy and vigorous economy. And there are indications that our record-breaking pace of development will continue indefinitely.

Present figures published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of September 3, 1965 indicate that the city and county building permits for the past 8 months are already 42 percent ahead of last year's level. Mr. Charles R. Wade, president of the Realty Mortgage Corp., says there may be nearly 5,000 single homes and 4,500 apartment units built this year.

As further evidence of our phenomenal building pace, Dunn & Bradstreet reports that for the first 7 months in 1965, Honolulu, the 43d largest city in the Nation, had the 6th largest value of building permits issued. The youngest of our 50 States is undergoing notable growth.

I am pleased to submit for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Honolulu Star-Bulletin story on Hawaii's record-breaking construction pace:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Sept. 3, 1965]

BUILDING PERMITS HERE RISE BY 42 PERCENT

Oahu construction is continuing its record-breaking pace, with estimated value of city-county building permits for the past 8 months running 42 percent ahead of last year's level.

Indications are that there may be nearly 5,000 single family building permits for \$63 million this year, topping all previous yearly totals, according to the Realty Mortgage Corp.

At the same rate, there may be 4,500 apartment units for a total of \$45 million, said Charles R. Wade, president, in the Mortgage Newsletter.

Honolulu, 43d largest city in the Nation, had the 6th largest value of building permits issued in the first 7 months, according to the latest monthly report from Dun & Bradstreet.

The city was in fifth place at the end of June, but now ranks behind New York, Los Angeles, Houston, Chicago, and San Francisco (in that order).

"Honolulu's building permits for the first 7 months are way out ahead of the same period last year—40 percent ahead in single family houses, and a whopping 63 percent in multifamily units," Realty Mortgage reported.

The permits' estimated value was more than \$140.5 million from January to August, compared with \$98.7 million for the same period last year.

The Department of Buildings issued 1,408 permits last month for an estimated value of more than \$19.4 million.

Projects included 392 homes, \$6 million value; 10 apartment houses with 233 units, \$3.1 million value; 4 school projects, \$1.8 million value; 5 stores and mercantile buildings, \$1.2 million value.

July totals were 1,751 permits with a value of \$19.7 million.

Using Tear Gas in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 27, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the question of using tear gas in the support of American and Vietnamese military operations in Vietnam against the Vietcong now appears to have been largely re-

solved. The hue and cry from the leftist press is subsiding. Nevertheless, it is well to note editorial support continues to build up from responsible publications.

I submit for reprinting in the RECORD the statement from the New York Times entitled "Using Tear Gas in Vietnam" and a statement from the pen of Louis R. Stockstill which appeared in the October 9 issue of the Journal of the Armed Forces. Both deserve careful thought:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1965]
USING TEAR GAS IN VIETNAM

A Marine battalion commander in Vietnam is under investigation because he utilized nonlethal tear gas to clear a cave and tunnel system of suspected Vietcong, allegedly in violation of policy regulations established by the U.S. commander in Vietnam. It seems unlikely that the Marine colonel deliberately violated orders; if he did, disobedience cannot be defended.

But on the larger issue of whether or not tear gas should have been used, protests that have arisen since the incident are based at the very best upon a complete misconception. In this case the use of tear gas was obviously more humane than any other effective type of action. No war, of course, can be humane, but the Vietnam war presents especially peculiar and difficult problems in this respect.

This is because the guerrilla melts into and is part of the civilian environment. In nearly every village "spider traps," tunnels and caves provide protection not only for the civilian population but excellent firing positions and hiding places for Vietcong snipers.

One of the biggest problems American face in Vietnam—and one that will become bigger as the days go on—is the problem of routing the Vietcong out of these underground positions. The answer is clearly tear gas, a simple nonlethal, riot-control agency used by most of the police forces of the world.

If the Government prohibits the use of tear gas, it will thereby condemn to certain death or injury many more Americans and Vietnamese than the absolute necessities of war demand. Nonlethal riot-control gases can be far more humane and will cause far fewer casualties than many of the weapons now being used in Vietnam.

[From the Journal of the Armed Forces, Oct. 9, 1965]

LET'S GET TEAR GAS BACK INTO ACTION (By Louis R. Stockstill)

A major, unresolved question relating to U.S. participation in the war in Vietnam is whether our unit commanders should be given blanket authority to use tear gas.

One way to answer the question and resolve the problem is to supply answers to some other basic questions.

Is use of the gas humane?

Is it a needed weapon?

Will it help bring the conflict to a speedier end?

Will it damage the U.S. image in the eyes of the world?

The comforting answer to the first question is "Yes." There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that use of the gas is humane. It neither cripples nor kills and it has no lingering ill effects. More importantly, it saves lives—not only of enemy troops who may someday have to help rebuild the war-torn country, but of innocent civilians, women and children.

The second question also can be answered affirmatively. When it is difficult to tell enemy from friend, and when civilians are herded into the enemy camp to act as a buffer against more violent forms of warfare, any humane weapon which can be substituted for the rifle, grenade, flame thrower,

October 13, 1965

etc., obviously is not only needed but required.

Whether use of tear gas will help bring the Vietnam conflict to a speedier conclusion is more difficult to answer. But, based on the efficacy of its use in quelling riots and other disturbances, it is obvious that the harmless gas destroys the desire and ability to fight. And that it does so almost as quickly, if not as permanently, as does a bullet. Furthermore, it enables our troops to do battle without the constant impediment posed by their genuine concern for the safety and well-being of innocent bystanders. Certainly use of the gas would win us more friends among the innocent and/or wavering survivors of those killed by lethal weapons. In this sense, it might well affect the war's duration.

It is necessary only to recall the bombardment of London by the Nazis during World War II to understand and appreciate how the will of a people stiffens when death is levied wholesale. Those who were and still are critical of our own use of the atomic bomb against Japan, should be the first to acknowledge the need for such innocuous instruments of warfare as tear gas.

As for any damage to our image resulting from expansion or unlimited use of this important weapon, it appears, as Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Armed Services Committee, frequently has opined, that the United States sometimes becomes overly preoccupied with this concern. Whatever damage might be anticipated could no doubt be countered with a carefully planned public relations program to inform and assure our friends around the globe that there are good reasons for our action, and that we are motivated by human kindness.

Our commander in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, reportedly has full authority, when and if he considers such action justified, to allow individual fighting units to use tear gas against the enemy. But this is not good enough. It means that unit commanders cannot order immediate use of the gas when immediacy may spell the difference between success or failure. It also means that our military commander is saddled with the unfair responsibility of having to, in effect, set U.S. policy in the field. The Government should take full responsibility for the use of this weapon, should announce its determination in strong terms and should extend to the smallest unit in the field the authority to put the order into effect wherever and whenever needed.

Those who have complained about the practice could be persuaded that it is both humane and morally sound, provided the Government took a strong stand and went to work to sell the decision to the world.

No one would argue with the fact that it is better to shed a few tears than to meet with violent death.

Cameron Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 11, 1965

ROLLCALL NOS. 258-263—21-DAY RULE

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, in my periodic rollcall reports I do not normally discuss House activity which occurred while I was attending to important business in my congressional district. But conscience does not permit me to observe without comment the irresponsible

tactics which were employed by the Republican leadership in their ill-advised effort to prevent the House from working its will on September 13.

I cannot recall any other time during my tenure as a Member of this body when the opposition has displayed such flagrant contempt for the legislative process and the rules under which it functions. We have only to examine what took place on the floor of the House on September 13 to verify the validity of this observation.

Let us briefly review the record:

On opening day of the 89th Congress the House voted to reinstate the 21-day rule which permits its 435 members to determine whether any piece of legislation, approved by its standing committees, shall be brought to the floor for debate and vote—rather than have that legislation killed by failure of the Rules Committee to act upon it. In other words, the House decided that it would no longer tolerate tactics designed to keep it from working its legislative will. And it wrote that decision into the rules under which we operate.

On September 13, under the 21-day procedure, four rules were sought in the House which, if approved by majority vote, would permit consideration of four pieces of important legislation—The Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1965, amendments to the Bank Company Act, establishment of a National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities, and the Federal Salary Adjustment Act of 1965.

On August 3 the Committee on Rules was asked to permit the Equal Employment Act to come to the floor. On June 21 a rule was requested on the Bank Holding bill. A rule was sought on July 14 for the Arts and Humanities legislation. On August 16 a rule was requested on the Federal pay bill. None of these rules was granted.

It is regrettable but very revealing that the chairman of the Rules Committee, responding to criticism from highly respected Members of the House, declared:

Why should we be kicked around in this way by picking up all the garbage out of the Rules Committee in instances in which the 21 days have expired and dumping it on the floor of the House on one day?

Mr. Speaker, I would not presume to speak for other Members of the House, but I view it as a direct insult to the American people and their elected representatives when legislation which is reported from committee after many hours of public hearings and careful deliberation is referred to as "garbage."

With this appraisal of important bills it is no wonder that the House found it necessary to resurrect these measures from the legislative graveyard known as the Rules Committee.

It was because the House decided that the time had come to work its will, not on "garbage" but upon matters of vital concern to the American people, that the Republican leadership engaged in its disgraceful obstructive tactics on September 13.

A front page story in the Washington Post summed it up this way:

When the House adjourned at 12:30 a.m.,

after a 12½-hour session and a record-breaking 22 rollcalls, the only forward motion had been adoption of resolutions permitting Democratic leaders at some future date to call up for House action four bills stuck in its Rules Committee.

Republicans—frustrated by their year-long wireless record, opposed to the 21-day rule and several of the bills, and irritated at being tossed such a big load of work on a Monday in mid-September—began a series of stalling tactics when the House met at noon.

The coalition forced repeated quorum calls, demanded that the entire Journal of the previous day's session be read and insisted upon rollcall votes on such usually pro forma motions as "dispensing with further proceedings" under the quorum calls.

Mr. Speaker, it was a wise man who said: "As I grow older I pay less attention to what men say. I just watch what they do."

If my Republican colleagues are really sincere in their alleged desire to promote a vigorous two-party system in this country, they will do well to reflect upon what the wise man said.

ROLLCALL NO. 301—ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. Speaker, having introduced a bill on the opening day of Congress calling for establishment of a National Humanities Foundation, I was elated that more than 100 Members subsequently joined in cosponsoring similar legislation. The fact that the President saw fit to include the measure as a part of the administration's specific legislative proposals was also a source of great satisfaction. The bill, however, cannot be interpreted as a partisan effort. It was President Eisenhower's Commission on National Goals which stated in a 1960 report:

In the eyes of posterity, the success of the United States as a civilized society will be largely judged by the creative activities of its citizens in art, architecture, literature, music, and the sciences.

Most opposition to the bill focused on the old bugaboo with which we are all familiar: Federal aid means Federal control. Not only has this mothworn charge been refuted time and again by the facts, but it is interesting to note that in recent years it has rarely been leveled at programs designed to aid the sciences. Yet it was dragged out against the arts and humanities, despite the clear wording of section 4(c) of the bill:

In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, or curriculum, or the administration or operation of any school or other non-Federal agency, institution, organization or association.

The Foundation receives additional independence through the provision permitting it to receive private donations and gifts. Thus the private sector gains a vested interest in insuring that the Government keeps its hands off the freedom of the individuals and institutions to be assisted.

Briefly put, the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities is being established to develop and promote a broad national policy of support for the arts and humanities. The National Council on the Arts through its endowment will provide matching grants to groups and